



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: HU et al.

Application Serial No.: 09/219,442

Art Unit: 1647

Filed: December 23, 1998

Examiner: Saoud, C.

For: Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor 2

Attorney Docket No.: PF112P2D1

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 TO PAPER NO. 20**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

RECEIVED  
SEP 14 2001  
TECH CENTER 1600/2900

In response to the communication mailed May 24, 2001 (Paper No. 20), Applicants hereby request that the Examiner's rejections be removed in light of the remarks enclosed herein. Applicants submit concurrently herewith: (a) a Petition for Extension of Time for three (3) months up to and including September 24, 2001; and (b) a Fee Transmittal, with appropriate fee(s).

**Remarks**

Claims 33-446 are pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections in view of the following remarks.

In the Official Action of September 19, 2000 (Paper No. 14), the Examiner initially rejected claims 33-446 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention, on the grounds of multiplicity. In support of this contention, the Examiner cited M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(n), stating that:

[a]n unreasonable number of claims, that is, unreasonable in view of the nature and scope of applicant's invention and the state of the art, may afford a basis for a rejection on the ground of multiplicity. A rejection on this ground should include all the claims in the case inasmuch as it related to confusion of the issue.

M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(n). Relying on this, the Examiner stated that Applicants "*should* select" 50 claims for the purposes of examination. Applicants, believing that the language "*should* select" was not a requirement, chose not to elect 50 claims for examination. In the reply mailed May 24, 2001, the Examiner held that the response was non-responsive and that Applicants "[m]ust select the required number of claims indicated by the Examiner." After discussing this issue with the Examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, Applicants maintain their position and respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reasoning and traverse this rejection.

MPEP § 2173.05(n) cites *In re Wakefield* to show that while a large number of claims may be tedious to examine, "this is no reason for saying that the invention is obscured by the large number of claims," which fully supports Applicants position. This Court further explains:

[a]n applicant often does not know all the prior art which may be asserted against his broader claims when he litigates his patent. Further, he is never sure that the broader claims will not be successfully attacked on other grounds when litigated in the courts . . . For these reasons, an applicant should be allowed to determine the necessary number and scope of his claims, provided he pays the required fees and otherwise complies with the statute.

*In re Wakefield*, 422 F.2d 897, 901. Applicants are not aware of any statutory requirements that require Applicants to limit the number of claims to 50. Applicants have also paid the required fees for prosecuting the pending claims. Thus, Applicants have followed permissible caselaw and statutory requirements and merely added a prudent set of claims of a different scope by which to protect their invention. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 33-446.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks Applicants believe they have fully addressed the Examiner's concerns and that this application is now in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is urged. A request is made to the Examiner to call the undersigned at the

phone number provided below if any further action by Applicants would expedite allowance of this application.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 08-3425. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept 10, 2001



Michele M. Wales (Reg. No. 43,975)  
Attorney for Applicants

**Human Genome Sciences, Inc.**  
9410 Key West Avenue  
Rockville, MD 20850  
Telephone: (301) 610-5772

Enclosures  
MMW/AKE/kp